



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

SERIAL NUMBER	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED APPLICANT	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
16/659,239	01/31/02	MOCHIZUKI	—

EXAMINER	
J. DOTE	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1756	

DATE MAILED:

EXAMINER INTERVIEW SUMMARY RECORD

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Mr. John Pike (Reg. No. 41,253) (3)  
(2) Janis L. Dote (4)

Date of interview: Nov. 17, 2003

Type: ☒ Telephonic ☐ Personal (copy is given to ☐ applicant ☐ applicant's representative).

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: ☐ Yes ☒ No. If yes, brief description:

Agreement ☐ was reached with respect to some or all of the claims in question. ☒ was not reached.

Claims discussed: 8

Identification of prior art discussed: none

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

This interview was initiated by Mr. Pike. Mr. Pike stated that the examples in the originally filed specification provide support for a two-component developing device. The examples in the specification use a particular commercial apparatus comprising a two-component developer device. Mr. Pike further stated that he believes that the broadly recited "developing unit wherein the developing unit comprises a toner vessel containing the dry toner according to claim 1" in claim 8 is supported by the originally filed specification. The examiner replied that the particular commercial apparatus may not provide an adequate written description of the apparatus broadly recited in instant claim 8. The examiner suggested that applicants file their arguments and any evidence to support their position.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

- ☒ 1. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

Unless the paragraph below has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW (e.g., items 1-7 of the second page of this form). If a response to the last Office action has already been filed, then applicant is given one month from this interview date to provide a statement of the substance of the interview.

- ☐ 2. Since the examiner's interview summary above (including any attachments) reflects a complete response to each of the objections, rejections and requirements that may be present in the last Office action, and since the claims are now allowable, this completed form is considered to fulfill the response requirements of the last Office action. Applicant is not relieved from providing a separate record of the substance of the interview unless box 1 above is also checked.

*Janis L. Dote*